



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/649,551	08/27/2003	Elias Gedamu	200208589-1	5533
22879	7590	02/17/2005	EXAMINER	
HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400			CHERVINSKY, BORIS LEO	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2835	

DATE MAILED: 02/17/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/649,551

Applicant(s)

GEDAMU ET AL.

Examiner

Boris L. Chervinsky

Art Unit

2835

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 August 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 7-12, 17-20, 24, 29, 33 and 34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) 4-6, 13-16, 21-23, 25-28 and 30-32 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 August 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-3, 12, 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fahey et al.

Fahey discloses a heat dissipation apparatus, comprising: a heat sink 12 that is adapted to receive a heat generating device 100 mounted thereto, the heat sink comprising an internal chamber 26 that is adapted to receive a fluid flow that removes heat from the heat sink; at least one hollow prong 16 that extends from the heat sink, the at least one hollow prong 16 being in fluid communication with the internal chamber 26 of the heat sink such that fluid forced into the internal chamber 26 flows through the at least one hollow prong 16; the at least one hollow prong 16 comprises a cylindrical tube having an internal passage, the internal passage being in fluid communication with the internal chamber of the heat sink. Fahey discloses the claimed invention except the processor as the heat-generating device. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to have the processor cooled by the device disclosed by Fahey since it has been held that a recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural

Art Unit: 2835

limitations. *Ex parte Masham*, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (1987). The method steps of claim 24 are necessitated by the device structure as disclosed by Fahey et al.

3. Claims 1, 7-11, 17-20, 29, 33-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kitahara et al.

Kitahara discloses a heat dissipation apparatus (see Fig. 70A and Fig.70B), comprising: a heat sink 2 that is adapted to receive a heat generating device 1 mounted thereto, the heat sink comprising an internal chamber that is adapted to receive a fluid flow that removes heat from the heat sink; an inlet that is in fluid communication with the internal chamber of the heat sink 2 such that fluid forced into the inlet flows into the internal chamber; a fan 3 that is in fluid communication with the inlet; the fan 3 comprises part of an internal flow fan module that is mounted to the heat sink; the heat sink comprises a bottom surface that is adapted to receive the heat generating device 1 and a top plate 91, the top plate 91 and a bottom plate together form the internal chamber. Kitahara et al. discloses the claimed invention except the processor as the heat-generating device. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to have the processor cooled by the device disclosed by Kitahara since it has been held that a recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural limitations. *Ex parte Masham*, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (1987).

***Allowable Subject Matter***

4. Claims 4-6, 13-16, 21-23, 25-28, 30-32 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim; but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Boris L. Chervinsky whose telephone number is 571-272-2039. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynn D. Feild can be reached on 571-272-2800 ext. 35. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

**BORIS CHERVINSKY  
PRIMARY EXAMINER**

*Boris L. Chervinsky*  
2/14/5